

REMARKS

1. The applicant hereby amends the written description. The entire "SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION" section is deleted. Page 5 is amended from line 16 to line 23. The abstract is amended.

2. Claims 1-45 are pending.

The applicant hereby cancels claims 2, 4, 6 and 16-45.

The applicant hereby amends claims 1, 3, 5, 7 and 10-11. All amendments are supported by the originally-filed application including, but not limited to, the following portions of the written description:

lines 12-13 of page 4;

lines 5-6 and 24-30 of page 5;

lines 1-10 of page 6;

lines 29-30 of page 7;

lines 1-9, 20-22 and 29-31 of page 8;

lines 2-10 and 24-31 of page 9;

lines 20-22 of page 10;

lines 5-8 and 31 of page 11;

lines 1 and 18-20 of page 12; and

lines 4-7 of page 13.

The applicant hereby adds twenty-three (23) new claims numbered 46-68.

3. The abstract was objected to on various grounds. In response, the abstract has been amended. As a result, it is believed this rejection has been traversed.

4. The disclosure, in particular, on page 5, lines 18-25, was objected to on various grounds. In response, the disclosure has been amended. As a result, it is believed this rejection has been traversed.

5. Claims 16-30 were rejected under section 112, second paragraph. As these claims now have been cancelled, no further discussion of these rejections is needed.

6. Claim 1 was rejected under section 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. In response, this claim has been amended to cure any deficiencies that might have existed with regard to the requirements of the cited statute. As a result, it is believed this rejection has been traversed.

7. Claims 1-15 were rejected under section 102 as being anticipated by Unno, U.S. Patent No. 6,437,875 (hereinafter "Unno"). In response, claim 1 has been amended to more clearly and more patentably distinguish the claimed invention over Unno. As a result, and for the reasons discussed below, it is believed this rejection has been traversed.

Based on M.P.E.P. section 706.02, "for anticipation under 35 U.S.C. 102, the reference (Unno) must teach every aspect of the claimed invention (in claim 1) either explicitly or impliedly. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present".

However, when claims 1-15 are compared to Unno, the following differences become apparent:

To begin, claim 1 is directed to "a method for modifying [a] message prior to sending the message," (claim 1). Further, as amended, claim 1 contains the following limitations:

- (a) displaying a plurality of choices of parameter values for the each parameter to the user;
- (b) when the user selects a particular parameter value from the displayed plurality of choices of parameter values, determining the user's selection, thus forming a selected parameter value for the each parameter; and
- (c) modifying the corresponding parameter value for the each parameter based on the selected parameter value;
and wherein each parameter of the plurality of parameters is based on the receiver (5).

(Claim 1, as amended)

In contrast, however, Unno simply does NOT disclose the SPECIFIC COMBINATION of the three (3) limitations (a), (b) and (c) presented above, TOGETHER WITH the added limitation "and wherein each parameter of the plurality of parameters is based on the receiver (5)" (emphasis supplied).

It is noted that the Office Action at section 9, paragraph 2, includes a plurality of references to Unno's "Figure 24" ("illustrating a SEND main screen which is displayed in a SEND mode", Unno, col. 3, lines 9-10) and "item 3215" ("scan setting button", Unno, col. 16, line 16).

In contrast, however, Unno's corresponding written description from col. 15, line 61 to col. 16, line 55 does not specify that the scan setting parameter corresponding to Unno's scan setting button 3215 is based on Unno's "selected destination" (Unno, col. 15, lines 62-66), as required by the limitation "wherein each parameter of the plurality of parameters is based on the receiver (5)", as in the present claim 1, emphasis added.

In summary, when the invention of claim 1 is compared with Unno, distinct differences become apparent. But unless Unno, by itself, discloses not only these differences but every limitation of claim 1, then claim 1 is allowable under section 102.

Dependent claims 3, 5 and 7-15 are believed allowable at least on the grounds that they depend on their common parent claim 1 which, as above, is itself allowable.

8. It is further believed that the new claims 46-68 are also allowable over Unno.

Application No.: 10/042,961
Art Unit 2174

In summary, further consideration of this application is respectfully requested.
Please direct questions to the phone numbers shown below.

Respectfully submitted,



Wayne J. Egan

Registration No. 33,168

Xerox Corporation

100 Clinton Avenue South

Xerox Square 20A

Rochester, New York 14644

Voice Phone: 585-423-4426

Fax Number: 585-423-5240